

Tanya E. Moore, SBN 206683  
MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.  
300 South First Street Ste. 342  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone (408) 298-2000  
Facsimile (408) 298-6046  
E-mail: [service@moorelawfirm.com](mailto:service@moorelawfirm.com)  
[tanya@moorelawfirm.com](mailto:tanya@moorelawfirm.com)

Attorney for Plaintiff  
Gerardo Hernandez

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GERARDO HERNANDEZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY  
dba SHERWIN-WILLIAMS PAINT STORE;  
JILL INVESTMENTS, LLC;

Defendants.

) No.

) **COMPLAINT ASSERTING DENIAL OF**  
) **RIGHT OF ACCESS UNDER THE**  
) **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**  
) **FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DAMAGES,**  
) **ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS (ADA)**

**I. SUMMARY**

1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff GERARDO HERNANDEZ ("Plaintiff") for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

Sherwin Williams  
20911 Foothill Blvd  
Hayward, California 94541  
(hereafter "the Facility")

2. Plaintiff seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs, against THE SHERWIN-WILLIAMS COMPANY and JILL INVESTMENTS, LLC

(hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”), pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.) (“ADA”) and related California statutes.

## **II. JURISDICTION**

3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA claims.

4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law – arising from the same nucleus of operative facts – is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

5. Plaintiff’s claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

## **III. VENUE**

6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Northern District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), (c).

## **IV. PARTIES**

7. Defendants own, operate, and/or lease the Facility, and consist of a person (or persons), firm, and/or corporation.

8. Plaintiff is substantially limited in his ability to walk, and must use a wheelchair for mobility. Consequently, Plaintiff is “physically disabled,” as defined by all applicable California and United States laws, and a member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

## **V. FACTS**

9. The Facility is open to the public, intended for non-residential use, and its operation affects commerce. The Facility is therefore a public accommodation as defined by applicable state and federal laws.

10. Plaintiff lives less than ten miles from the Facility and visited the Facility on or about November 7, 2019 to purchase paint supplies. During his visit to the Facility, Plaintiff encountered the following barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with, if not outright denied, Plaintiff’s ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges and

1 accommodations offered at the Facility:

- 2 a) Plaintiff could not locate any designated accessible parking in the  
3 Facility's parking lot, and had to park in a standard parking stall.
- 4 b) Plaintiff also observed that the landing outside the entrance was  
5 improperly configured and did not provide sufficient maneuvering space  
6 for his wheelchair. This caused him great concern that he would have  
7 difficulty entering and he decided to wait in his vehicle while his brother  
8 went inside to purchase the paint.

9 11. The barriers identified in paragraph 10 herein are only those that Plaintiff  
10 personally encountered. Plaintiff is presently unaware of other barriers which may in fact exist  
11 at the Facility and relate to his disabilities. Plaintiff will seek to amend this Complaint once  
12 such additional barriers are identified as it is Plaintiff's intention to have all barriers which  
13 exist at the Facility and relate to his disabilities removed to afford him full and equal access.

14 12. Plaintiff was, and continues to be, deterred from visiting the Facility because  
15 Plaintiff knows that the Facility's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and  
16 accommodations were and are unavailable to Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's physical disabilities.  
17 Plaintiff enjoys the goods and services offered at the Facility, and will return to the Facility  
18 once the barriers are removed.

19 13. Defendants knew, or should have known, that these elements and areas of the  
20 Facility were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to  
21 the physically disabled. Moreover, Defendants have the financial resources to remove these  
22 barriers from the Facility (without much difficulty or expense), and make the Facility  
23 accessible to the physically disabled. To date, however, Defendants refuse to either remove  
24 those barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.

25 14. At all relevant times, Defendants have possessed and enjoyed sufficient control  
26 and authority to modify the Facility to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to  
27 comply with the 1991 ADA Accessibility Guidelines and/or the 2010 ADA Standards for  
28 Accessible Design. Defendants have not removed such impediments and have not modified the

1 Facility to conform to accessibility standards. Defendants have intentionally maintained the  
 2 Facility in its current condition and have intentionally refrained from altering the Facility so  
 3 that it complies with the accessibility standards.

4 15. Plaintiff further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the Facility is  
 5 so obvious as to establish Defendants' discriminatory intent. On information and belief,  
 6 Plaintiff avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes Defendants' refusal to adhere  
 7 to relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the  
 8 Facility; conscientious decision to maintain the architectural layout (as it currently exists) at the  
 9 Facility; decision not to remove barriers from the Facility; and allowance that Defendants'  
 10 property continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Plaintiff further alleges, on information  
 11 and belief, that the Facility is not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the  
 12 Facility are not isolated or temporary interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.

## 13 **VI. FIRST CLAIM**

### 14 **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**

#### 15 Denial of "Full and Equal" Enjoyment and Use

16 16. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in  
 17 each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

18 17. Title III of the ADA holds as a "general rule" that no individual shall be  
 19 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of  
 20 goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns,  
 21 operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

22 18. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff by denying Plaintiff "full and equal  
 23 enjoyment" and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges and accommodations of the  
 24 Facility during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

#### 25 Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

26 19. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which  
 27 are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42  
 28 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

20. When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not readily achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or accommodations available through alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. *Id.* § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

21. Here, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants can easily remove the architectural barriers at the Facility without much difficulty or expense, and that Defendants violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily achievable to do so.

22. In the alternative, if it was not “readily achievable” for Defendants to remove the Facility’s barriers, then Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make the required services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

#### Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

23. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was designed and constructed (or both) after January 26, 1993 – independently triggering access requirements under Title III of the ADA.

24. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy after January 26, 1993, that aren’t readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).

25. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by designing and constructing (or both) the Facility in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public – including Plaintiff – when it was structurally practical to do so.<sup>1</sup>

#### Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

26. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was modified after January 26, 1993, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.

27. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects (or could affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that Plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.

primary function also requires making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. Id.

28. Here, Defendants altered the Facility in a manner that violated the ADA and was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public – including Plaintiff – to the maximum extent feasible.

#### Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

29. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

30. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Facility, when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.

#### Failure to Maintain Accessible Features

31. Defendants additionally violated the ADA by failing to maintain in operable working condition those features of the Facility that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.

32. Such failure by Defendants to maintain the Facility in an accessible condition was not an isolated or temporary interruption in service or access due to maintenance or repairs.

33. Plaintiff seeks all relief available under the ADA (i.e., injunctive relief, attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.

### **VII. SECOND CLAIM**

#### **Unruh Act**

34. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

//



45. Plaintiff alleges the Facility is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code § 4450 (or both), and that the Facility was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.

46. Defendants' non-compliance with these requirements at the Facility aggrieved (or potentially aggrieved) Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.

### IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, for:

1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.
2. Statutory minimum damages under section 52(a) of the California Civil Code according to proof.
3. Attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.<sup>2</sup>
4. Interest at the legal rate from the date of the filing of this action.
5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: 2/13/2020

MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.

/s/ Tanya E. Moore

Tanya E. Moore

Attorney for Plaintiff

Gerardo Hernandez

<sup>2</sup> This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.



**VERIFICATION**

I, GERARDO HERNANDEZ, am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing Complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: 2/13/2020

/s/ Gerardo Hernandez

Gerardo Hernandez

I attest that the original signature of the person whose electronic signature is shown above is maintained by me, and that his concurrence in the filing of this document and attribution of his signature was obtained.

/s/ Tanya E. Moore

Tanya E. Moore

Attorney for Plaintiff,

GERARDO HERNANDEZ